



DFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s) : Jose Carlos Garza-Davila, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,198
For : **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR CHANGE-OVER OF
THE MOLTEN METAL COATING COMPOSITION IN A
STEEL STRIP COATING LINE**
Filed : October 31, 2003
Examiner : Timothy Meeks
Art Unit : 1762
Confirmation No. : 3473

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service with sufficient postage as
first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner
of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria,
VA 22313-1450, on April 15, 2005

Name of Applicant, Assignee or Registered
Representative: A. Thomas S. Safford, Esq.

RESPONSE

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement in the Official Action mailed February 16, 2005, to which response is currently due Monday, April 18, 2005 (with a one month Extension of Time, which extension is hereby requested), the applicants hereby timely elect in compliance with the restriction requirement to proceed with the prosecution of the Group I claims, namely process claims 1-10.

The one month extension fee (and any other fee occasioned by this paper, and not accounted for by an enclosed check) may be charged, or overpayment credited, to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed on the basis that the examination with respect to the process claims would necessarily encompass the same prior art as would be appropriate to the apparatus claims and therefore given the essentially co-extensive nature of the search required, it would be most beneficial for both efficiency and cost savings to the applicants as well as to the Patent and Trademark Office that this case proceed without restriction.

MPEP §803 mandates that for a restriction requirement there must not only be more than one invention in the claims, but also, there must be an undue or serious burden on the Examiner in searching and examining both inventions or groups of claims in the one application.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to demonstrate the requisite undue or serious burden justifying restriction.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are earnestly solicited.

It is understood that this application is now complete and action on the merits in due course is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys For Applicants

By 

A. Thomas S. Safford, of counsel
Registration No. 21,002
745 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10151
Tel (212) 588-0800
Fax (212) 588-0500
tsafford@FLHlaw.com